

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/646,391	08/21/2003	Martin Gleave	UBC.P-035	9734	
	7590 03/05/2007 & Associates, LLC		EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 492	8		BOWMAN, AMY HUDSON		
DILLON, CO 80435			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1635		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/646,391	GLEAVE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Amy H. Bowman	1635		

before the I ming of all Appear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Amy H. Bowman	1635	ŧ				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 November 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THE 1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.					
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follor places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complian time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u> 2.	nliance with 37 CER 41 37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below. 	onsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		ducina or simplifyina	the issues for				
appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. \overline{oxtime} Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		•	•				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will by ided below or appended.	Il be entered and an o	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-10 and 14</u> .	•						
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>11 and 12</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal 	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because;				
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:							
	41 Schrift	Amy H Pauman					
	JAMES SCHULTZ, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER	Amy H Bowman Examiner Art Unit: 1635					
	weite # 1						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As a result of the petition decision on 1/26/07, oligodeoxynucleotide SEQ ID NOs: 2-19 have been rejoined. Claims 11 and 12 remain withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Therefore, applicant has not cancelled the non-elected subject matter. Claims 2-10 and 14 are in condition for allowance, however there is still an outstanding issue with regards to claim 1 as explained below.

Applicant's arguments do not overcome the pending rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. As explained in the office actions mailed on 4/14/06 and 9/18/06, one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize that applicant was in possession of such a large scope of therapeutic agents, as instantly recited. Upon further consideration, the description regarding antisense oligonucleotides and RNAi inhibitors is sufficient to describe oligonucleotides, as recited in claim 14.

With regards to claim 1, applicant argues that applicants have no control over inhibitors that have not yet been described in the art. However, the test for written description is possession and applicant clearly is not in possession of any therapeutic agent that is effective to reduce the amount of clusterin in melanoma cells by disclosing antisense oligonucleotides and RNAi inhibitors. The claim embraces a multitude of inhibitors such as small molecule inhibitors, antibodies, miRNAs, ribozymes, aptamers, as well as any other inhibitory agent. It is noted that it is improper for applicant to argue an unpublished board decision and such arguments have not been considered. Applicant argues In re Fuetterer, which was responded to by the examiner in the office action mailed on 9/18/06. The examiner is not requiring for applicant to discover which possible therapeutic agents will function properly in the method, but rather is requiring a description of an adequate number of species of therapeutic agents to be used by the method that is commensurate with the scope of the instant claim so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention.